Remarks

In the present response, claims 1 – 24 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102(e)

Claims 1 – 24 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by USPN 6,834,341 (Bahl). These rejections are traversed.

Each of the independent claims recites numerous recitations that are not taught in Bahl. By way of example, claim 1 recites that the access point is a single device that links the guests to the Internet. Bahl does not teach or even suggest this recitation.

FIG. 3A in Bahl shows the exemplary system architecture. This system includes an access module 112a and a separate authentication/negotiation component 110a. Bahl describes the access modules 112a as comprising one or more access points 306 that permit wireless access constituting a wireless subnet (see Bahl at column 9, lines 44-50). Bahl then describes the authentication/negotiation component 110a as being a separate server in communication with the access modules 112a:

> In the illustrated example, authentication/negotiation component
> 110a comprises a serer 302 (referred to herein as a "Protocol for
> Authentication and Negotiation of Services" or "PANS" server) and a
> Policy Manager 304. The PANS server 302 may or may not be
> configured to receive wireless communication from access module
> 112a. (See Bahl at column 10, lines 12-17).

Clearly Bahl expressly teaches separate components of an access point and a server used for authenticating users. By contrast, claim 1 recites a single device as an access point that includes three elements: an ISP network interface, a wireless network interface, and authentication/authorization logic. Bahl does not teach a single device with these three elements.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over Bahl.

Claim 11 recites various elements not taught in Bahl. By way of example, claim 11 recites (emphasis added):

> detecting **at an access point** a request for Internet access from a guest;
>
> determining **at the access point** if the guest is permitted to use the Internet service;
>
> gathering **at the access point** information regarding usage patterns of the guest, **the access point being a single device that links the guest to the Internet.**

As noted, Bahl expressly teaches an access module 112a and a <u>separate</u> authentication/negotiation component 110a or separate server. Bahl does not teach performing the reciting elements in claim 11 in a single device.

For at least these reasons, claim 11 and its dependent claims are allowable over Bahl.

Independent claims 16 and 21 recite numerous elements not taught in Bahl. By way of example, these claims recite that the access point is a single device. As noted, Bahl expressly teaches an access module 112a and a <u>separate</u> authentication/negotiation component 110a or separate server.

For at least these reasons, claims 16 and 21 and their respective dependent claims are allowable over Bahl.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529